

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 7, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the foregoing amendment in light of the following remarks.

Status of the Application

Upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 19-20, 22-23, 25, 28-32, 35-38 have been amended. Claims 21, 26-27, 33-34 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 19-20, 22-25, 28-32, 35-38 are pending with Claims 19, 25, 32 being independent and the remaining claims being dependent claims.

Canceled Claims

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of claims 21, 26-27, and 33-34 being cancelled by the present amendment, the rejections of these claims is not moot. As such, Applicant respectfully requests these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 101

Claims 32, 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In lieu of the present amendment, Applicant believes these claims are allowable, and as such, respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claims 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In lieu of the present Amendment, Applicant believe the claim is allowable, and as such, respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Traversal of Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 19 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,483,999 (Anderson) and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/021454 (Johnson).

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,712 (Turpin).

Anderson is seen to disclose a printer which interrupts a processing of a print job when receiving an interrupt signal of the print job from a user. The Office Action states that Anderson does not explicitly disclose the limitation of "the halt command is inserted into the specific page selected from the document data," but that Johnson discloses this limitation.

Johnson is seen to disclose a multiplexer which purges a job including a backchannel command when receiving a cancellation instruction from a host computer.

The method is used to dynamically examine the content of an incoming job and direct jobs that request backchannel data to the print engine rather than the spooler.

The present invention describes an overlay printing, as described in paragraph 0050 of the present specification, where data in a page unit is overlaid on a form such as “an estimate form” and “a bill form.” Therefore, present invention provides for temporarily halt a printing process so that a user can set a sheet for an arbitrary form selected by the user to a printer before the execution of the overlay printing by using the selected form.

Amended Independent Claim 19 of the present invention includes at least the feature of selecting an arbitrary form from a plurality of forms, where a halt command to halt print processing is generated using the arbitrary form. This feature allows a user to halt a printing process by using a selected form even if the number of pages to be generated changes due to page data such as an overlay printing.

Nothing in Anderson or Johnson, either taken alone or in combination, is seen to describe or disclose at least the above-identified feature of the present invention. More specifically, nothing in Anderson or Johnson is seen to address halting a printing process at a position desired by a user when the number of pages to be generated changes due to page data such as overlay printing

Claim 19 of the present invention also includes the feature of determining whether a form of a printing object is the selected arbitrary form when a print processing using a composite form file is instructed. Accordingly, a halt command can be generated at an

appropriate timing. Neither Anderson or Johnson, either alone or in combination, are seen to describe or disclose at least the above-described feature of the present invention.

Applicant submits that neither Anderson or Johnson, either alone or in combination, teach at least the aforementioned features of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 19 be withdrawn and the Examiner indicate allowance of Claim 19 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent claims 25 and 32 were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 19. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that the Examiner indicate allowance of Claims 25 and 32 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The remaining claims depend from one of allowable base claims 19, 25, or 32, and are thus believed allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn and that the Examiner indicate allowance of these claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of such claims as the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached at (949) 932-3329. All correspondences should be directed to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

11/7/07
Date

/Sivon Kalminov/
Sivon Kalminov
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,042

CANON U.S.A., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA. 02618
Facsimile: (949) 932-3560